

(2) No interviews will be allowed in the Committee room while the Committee is in session. Individual interviews must take place before the gavel falls for the convening of a meeting or after the gavel falls for adjournment.

(3) Day-to-day notification of the next day's electronic coverage shall be provided by the media to the Chairman of the full Committee through an appropriate designee.

(4) Still photography during a Committee meeting will not be permitted to disrupt the proceedings or block the vision of Committee Members or witnesses.

(5) Further conditions may be specified by the Chairman.

D. MARKUPS

Rule 18. Reconsideration of Previous Vote

When an amendment or other matter has been disposed of, it shall be in order for any Member of the prevailing side, on the same or next day on which a quorum of the Committee is present, to move the reconsideration thereof, and such motion shall take precedence over all other questions except the consideration of a motion to adjourn.

Rule 19. Previous Question

The Chairman shall not recognize a Member for the purpose of moving the previous question unless the Member has first advised the Chair and the Committee that this is the purpose for which recognition is being sought.

Rule 20. Postponement of Proceedings

The Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment.

The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time. In exercising postponement authority the Chairman shall take reasonable steps to notify members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote.

When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

Rule 21. Motion to go to Conference

The Chairman is authorized to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives whenever the chairman considers it appropriate.

Rule 22. Official Transcripts of Markups and Other Committee Meetings

An official stenographic transcript shall be kept accurately reflecting all markups and other meetings of the full Committee and the Subcommittees, whether they be open or closed to the public. This official transcript, marked as "uncorrected," shall be available for inspection by the public (except for meetings closed pursuant to clause 2(g)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House), by Members of the House, or by Members of the Committee together with their staffs, during normal business hours in the full Committee or Subcommittee office under such controls as the Chairman of the full Committee deems necessary. Official transcripts shall not be removed from the Committee or Subcommittee office. If, however, (1) in the drafting of a Committee or Subcommittee decision, the Office of the House Legislative Counsel or (2) in the preparation of a Committee report, the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation determines (in consultation with appropriate majority and minority committee staff) that it is necessary to review the official transcript of a markup, such transcript may be released upon the signature and to the custody of an appropriate committee staff person. Such tran-

script shall be returned immediately after its review in the drafting session.

The official transcript of a markup or Committee meeting other than a public hearing shall not be published or distributed to the public in any way except by a majority vote of the Committee. Before any public release of the uncorrected transcript, Members must be given a reasonable opportunity to correct their remarks. In instances in which a stenographic transcript is kept of a conference committee proceeding, all of the requirements of this rule shall likewise be observed.

Rule 23. Publication of Decisions and Legislative Language

A press release describing any tentative or final decision made by the full Committee or a Subcommittee on legislation under consideration shall be made available to each Member of the Committee as soon as possible, but no later than the next day. However, the legislative draft of any tentative or final decision of the full Committee or a Subcommittee shall not be publicly released until such draft is made available to each Member of the Committee.

E. STAFF

Rule 24. Supervision of Committee Staff

The staff of the Committee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman of the full Committee except as provided in clause 9 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives concerning Committee expenses and staff.

Pursuant to clause 6(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the full Committee, from the funds made available for the appointment of Committee staff pursuant to primary and additional expense resolutions, shall ensure that each Subcommittee receives sufficient staff to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee, and that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff.

Rule 25. Staff Honoraria, Speaking Engagements, and Unofficial Travel

This rule shall apply to all majority and minority staff of the Committee and its Subcommittees.

a. Honoraria.—Under no circumstances shall a staff person accept the offer of an honorarium. This prohibition includes the direction of an honorarium to a charity.

b. Speaking engagements and unofficial travel.—

(1) Advance approval required.—In the case of all speaking engagements, fact-finding trips, and other unofficial travel, a staff person must receive approval by the full Committee Chairman (or, in the case of the minority staff, from the Ranking Minority Member) at least 7 calendar days prior to the event.

(2) Request for approval.—A request for approval must be submitted in writing to the full Committee Chairman (or, where appropriate, the Ranking Minority Member) in connection with each speaking engagement, fact-finding trip, or other unofficial travel. Such request must contain the following information:

(a) the name of the sponsoring organization and a general description of such organization (nonprofit organization, trade association, etc.);

(b) the nature of the event, including any relevant information regarding attendees at such event;

(c) in the case of a speaking engagement, the subject of the speech and duration of staff travel, if any; and

(d) in the case of a fact-finding trip or international travel, a description of the proposed itinerary and proposed agenda of sub-

stantive issues to be discussed, as well as a justification of the relevance and importance of the fact-finding trip or international travel to the staff member's official duties.

(3) Reasonable travel and lodging expenses.—After receipt of the advance approval in (1) above, a staff person may accept reimbursement by an appropriate sponsoring organization of reasonable travel and lodging expenses associated with a speaking engagement, fact-finding trip, or international travel related to official duties, provided such reimbursement is consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives. (In lieu of reimbursement after the event, expenses may be paid directly by an appropriate sponsoring organization.) The reasonable travel and lodging expenses of a spouse (but not children) may be reimbursed (or directly paid) by an appropriate sponsoring organization consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(4) Trip summary and report.—In the case of any reimbursement or direct payment associated with a fact-finding trip or international travel, a staff person must submit, within 60 days after such trip, a report summarizing the trip and listing all expenses reimbursed or directly paid by the sponsoring organization. This information shall be submitted to the Chairman (or, in the case of the minority staff, to the Ranking Minority Member).

c. Waiver.—The Chairman (or, where appropriate, the Ranking Minority Member) may waive the application of section (b) of this rule upon a showing of good cause.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

THE REAL ID ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled tomorrow to take up the REAL ID Act which, among other things, will prevent illegal immigrants from obtaining driver's licenses. It will require States to issue driver's licenses to foreign nationals that expire no later than their visas expire, and it will expedite the completion of a fence along the U.S.-Mexico border along California.

Last year the bill's author, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER), took a lot of grief for holding up passage on the intelligence reform bill over many of these provisions. The press and others lambasted the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) for holding up an important piece of legislation over what they called "unrelated immigration provisions." I want to commend the chairman for hanging tough.

This debate has, unfortunately, been cast as one that pits those who support the President's temporary worker plan with those who support the provisions in the REAL ID Act. Nothing could be further from the truth.

There is no greater supporter of President Bush's proposals to reform our immigration laws in this body than I am. I believe that a comprehensive temporary worker plan is the best way to enhance national security at the border. Support for a temporary worker plan is consistent with support for the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) bill. In fact, I voted against the intelligence reform bill last year precisely because the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) provisions were not included. Further, the provision on driver's licenses in the Sensenbrenner bill largely mirror provisions that I introduced in a bill in 2002.

Critics of the President's immigration reform bill use words like "unsafe," "insecure," and "dangerous" when talking about a temporary worker plan. But those of us who advocate such a program are no less concerned about national security than our counterparts. In fact, national security is probably the best case that can be made for a meaningful temporary worker program.

Right now we have somewhere between 8 and 15 million illegal immigrants in this country. The vast majority of these people came here simply to work, but we can be sure that a small number are here with more sinister intentions. But given the number of illegal immigrants who are here in the country, trying to find the terrorists, the drug smugglers, the human traffickers amounts to trying to find a needle in a haystack. But if we can offer a framework under which workers can register to legally come to this country and work, we can drastically reduce the size of that haystack and focus our resources on finding the needles.

Some will say that rather than implementing a temporary worker program, we simply need to enforce the laws against illegal immigration that are on the books. That is all well and good, Mr. Speaker, but enforcing the current law would require that we round up everyone who is here illegally and ship them home. Remember, there are as many as 10 million illegal workers here right now. I have not heard one of my colleague seriously recommend that we round all of them up and send them home, yet that is what enforcing the law means.

That said, it seems to me that we have just two choices. We can put in place a temporary worker program and register those who are working here illegally, or we can continue to pretend they do not exist, thus forcing them to work in the shadows, as they have been doing for years now. The latter course is obviously not in the best interest of our Nation's security.

This brings me back to the debate on tomorrow's REAL ID Act. I suspect that in the debate tomorrow on this House floor, there will be talk about how these measures cut down and crack down on illegal immigration. As important as this legislation is, it will

do little to deal with the problem of illegal immigration. These provisions will help red-flag those who are currently in the country illegally, we all remember that many of the hijackers were issued valid driver's licenses that expired long after their visas did, but they will not do much to keep more illegal aliens from coming here and working in the shadows.

There is much more we need to do, Mr. Speaker, and it must start with an honest discussion about how we deal with this country's labor needs as well as our national security needs. I look forward to beginning that discussion as soon as we pass this legislation.

BUDGET PRIORITIES AND MORAL VALUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Bush delivered to this Congress his proposed Federal budget. In the coming months, Democrats and Republicans in Congress will debate budget proposals largely based on divergent cardinal moral values. We will debate budget cuts that represent more than just program additions or scale-backs.

The President's proposed cuts to vital government programs are reflective of differences in moral core philosophies on the role of our government in serving our people. Budgets are moral documents that reveal fundamental priorities of a person, of a household, of a community, of a business, of a government.

There is no better example of where Democratic and Republican values diverge than on Medicaid. The President claims he only wants to cut programs that are either not getting results or that duplicate current efforts or that do not fulfill essential priorities.

As Democrats, we could not agree more on the need for efficient government. That was how we balanced the budget in the 1990s. But which of those three criteria does the President mean when he talks about Medicaid?

There is no question Medicaid gets results. In spite of what my friends on the other side of the aisle like to demagogue, it operates at a lower cost than private health insurance. Private health insurance has in the last few years grown at 12.7 percent; Medicare has grown at 7.1 percent.

Medicaid costs have grown at only 4.5 percent a year. There is no duplication in Medicaid. It is the only program of its kind. It fulfills an essential priority. It is the sole source of nursing home care for 5 million senior citizens in our country who are living in poverty.

The President knows Medicaid is already running on fumes, but he made a choice. He chose to give more tax cuts to the most affluent 1 percent of Americans rather than provide subsistence

care for senior citizens. That is the choice he made, different priorities reflecting a different set of moral values.

Medicaid provides health coverage to 52 million Americans, 1.7 million in my State of Ohio alone. It is the only source of coverage for one out of four Ohio children. It provides 70 percent of nursing home funding in my State of Ohio.

Think about divergent moral values, what we stand for, in our government, in our homes and our families and in our communities. The Bush proposal cuts \$60 billion, billion with a "b", \$60 billion out of Medicaid over the next 10 years. Ask hospitals, ask health care experts, ask senior groups, these cuts will mean kicking seniors out of nursing homes. We have a moral obligation to prevent that from happening.

The President's plan shifts tens of millions of dollars of costs to States, like Ohio, already facing severe financial shortfalls.

The President cannot eliminate basic needs by ignoring them. He cannot eliminate the nursing home care for seniors by ignoring nursing home care or by shifting responsibility to the States which simply cannot afford it. In the short run, his budget cuts will create victims. In the long run, it will force the State to spend more.

And how will that happen? How will the States be able to take care of this? Students will have to pay higher tuition. Homeowners will have to pay higher property tax. Consumers will have to pay higher sales tax. Workers will have to pay higher income tax to make up for the cuts in Medicaid and to make up for the President's huge tax cuts for the wealthiest, most privileged 1 percent.

Medicaid is a partnership between the Federal and State government. Cutting the Federal share hurts our families, hurts our schools, hurts our communities, hurts our States.

We can give up, Mr. Speaker, many things in the name of shared sacrifice, as we should, but common sense should not be one of those things we give up. The President's every-man-for-himself budget neglects our communities and betrays our moral values as a nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.